REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 28, 2003. Claims 1-21 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, and 15 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, and 8 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Campman (U.S. Patent No. 6,016,099; hereinafter "Campman"). The Office Action also rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campman in view of Christiansen (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,077; hereinafter "Christiansen"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campman in view of Lindauer (U.S. Patent No. 5,714,847; hereinafter "Lindauer"). The Office Action also rejected Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campman in view of Thorgersen (U.S. Patent No. 5,524,101; hereinafter "Thorgersen"). The Office Action also rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campman in view of Liang (U.S. Patent No. 5,570,698; hereinafter "Liang"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delicia (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,949; hereinafter "Delicia") in view of Curry (U.S. Patent No. 3,922,665;

hereinafter "Curry"). The Office Action also rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delicia and Curry in view of Christiansen. The Office Action also rejected Claims 11, 12, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delicia and Curry in view of Lindauer. The Office Action also rejected Claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delicia and Curry in view of Thorgersen. The Office Action also rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delicia and Curry in view of Liang.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending application and claims are patentable for at least the following reasons.

Applicants' Claim 1 recites: "[A] method for adjusting alarm clock signals, the method comprising the steps of: (a) tracking behavior of a person in a predetermined area under surveillance after the activation of an alarm clock; (b) determining whether the person is motionless within a first predetermined time period; and, (c) if motionless, gradually increasing the alarm clock signals of said alarm clock."

It is respectfully submitted that Campman fails to recite or suggest tracking behavior of a person in a predetermined area under surveillance. Rather, Campman recites a personal alarm safety system utilizing sensors such as mechanical metal balls, and solid-state accelerometers (see, e.g., Col. 2, lines 30-41). Such

sensors do not perform the step of tracking within an area under surveillance as recited in Applicants' Claim 1. No actual area is observed in Campman, nor is any tracking performed. Thus, Applicants respectfully believe Claim 1 to be patentable over Campman for at least these reasons.

Claims 9 and 15 recite methods substantially corresponding to Claim 1 and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, Applicants respectfully believe that neither Delicia nor Curry also fail to recite or suggest any form of tracking within an area under surveillance. Delicia merely recites a pillow with an incorporated alarm system with a pressure senor and Curry also fails to recite or suggest tracking with an area under surveillance. Thus Applicants respectfully believe Claims 9 and 15 to be patentable over Delicia and Curry because the combination of the references fails to recite all the claimed elements of Claims 9 and 15.

Claims 2-8, 10-14, and 16-21 depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. In addition, however, each is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, and should be individually considered on its own merits. Further, Applicants respectfully believe the § 103 rejections of Claims 3-7, 10-14, and

16-21 to be moot in light of the above amendments and remarks. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejections.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the currently-pending claims are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims over the references cited, and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Aaron Waxler,
Reg. No. 48,027
Agent
(914) 333-9608
May 28, 2003